

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 remain in this application. Claims 1-12 are rejected. Claims 1-12 are amended herein to clarify the invention, to broaden language as deemed appropriate and to address matters of form unrelated to substantive patentability issues.

Applicants herein traverse and respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of the claims and objection cited in the above-referenced Office Action.

The Office Action reminds applicants of the proper language and format for the abstract of the disclosure. Applicants submit herewith a substitute specification and abstract wherein amendments are effected to place the text thereof into conformance with 37 CFR 1.72 and MPEP §608.01(b) and in accordance with 37 CFR 1.125(c). Also accompanying this amendment is a reproduction of the original specification and abstract with markings indicating the amendments effected in the substitute specification in accordance with MPEP §608.01(q) and 37 CFR 1.125(b). No new matter is added. Entry of the substitute specification and abstract is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as not being enabled by the specification, and under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Grounds for both rejections are based upon the applicants' use of the term

“flame” throughout the specification and claims. As the Examiner has suspected, the correct term, which is accepted in the art, and which is the intended meaning as clearly apparent within the context of the disclosure taken as a whole, is “frame.” A substitute specification has been prepared, and changes the term to reflect the correct and intended meaning. The claims have been likewise amended, and conform with the specification in its present form. No new matter is added. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of the claims under both 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and their allowance are earnestly requested.

The drawings are amended to effect changes to Figs. 1, 2 and 3. The attached replacement drawing sheets replace the original sheets including Figs. 1, 2 and 3, and correct the term “flame” in the original drawings to the proper term “frame,” in conformance with the substitute specification submitted herewith. The applicants elect to delay filing corrected formal drawings until subsequent to the receipt of a Notice of Allowability as per PTOL-37 and CFR §1.85(c).

Claims 1-4 and 9-12 are rejected as obvious over Natori (US 6,243,060) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicants herein respectfully traverse this rejection. For a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to be sustained, the differences between the features of the combined references and the present invention must be obvious to one skilled in the art.

According to amended independent claim 1, a method for displaying an image by outputting image data by each frame to a display device is capable of setting alternatively a first display mode which displays image data on the display device with a different pixel arrangement for each frame and a second display mode which displays image data on said display device with an identical pixel arrangement for each frame.

The method comprises steps of judging a scale of a processing load performed within one frame, and setting the first display mode when the load is judged to be relatively light or setting the second display mode when the load is judged to be relatively heavy.

According to the above claimed features, the method according to the present invention is capable of switching between the two display modes depending on the processing load. Therefore, even if the computer processing power is low, a disorder of the picture quality can be prevented so that an image can be displayed with a well-balanced adjustment between the quantity of processing and the picture quality.

On the other hand, Natori discloses a method for arranging color elements on a screen. According to Natori, the color elements (R, B, G) are arranged in-line in one row on the screen, and the color element having the highest luminosity factor is arranged in-line according to a predetermined rule (see col. 3, line 7-36). The arrangement of the color elements is never changed in dependence on the processing load. Natori fails to teach or suggest a display mode in which an image is displayed

with different arrangements of color elements. Additionally, Natori is devoid of teaching relating to plural display modes (first and second display modes) which are switched depending on the processing load, as claimed in independent claim 1.

Independent claim 9 is similarly directed to a computer readable storage medium storing an image display program which causes a computer to perform a method which includes judging a processing load performed within one frame as being one of relatively light and relatively heavy, and alternatively setting a display mode to either a first display mode or a second display mode depending upon the judgment results, wherein image data is displayed on the display device with a different pixel arrangement for each frame when in the first display mode, and with an identical pixel arrangement for each frame when in the second display mode.

As mentioned above, this feature are not taught by Natori.

Applicants submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness could not be established in the rejection of the claims as amended because the Natori reference fails to disclose all claimed features of both independent claim 1 and 9, as would be properly required.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejected claims are not obvious in view of the cited reference for the reasons stated above. Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-4 and 9-12 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 5-8 are rejected as obvious over Natori in view of Sakamoto et al. (US 6,480,192) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicants herein respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 5 is directed to a game machine capable of implementing the method of claim 1 by switching between first and second display modes depending upon a relative degree of processing load. As discussed above, the primary Natori reference fails to teach this display approach.

It is respectfully submitted that the secondary Sakamoto et al. reference is equally deficient in disclosing this feature by which picture quality can be maintained so that an image can be displayed with a well-balanced adjustment between the quantity of processing and the picture quality. Sakamoto et al. merely discloses an invention for making a far-distant image more blurred than a nearer-distant image on a display (see Abstract, Fig.15). A displayed image of the far-distant image is made by overlaying an image (Fig. 13: α') shifted by one pixel portion on the original image (Fig. 13: α) (see Col.3, lines 63-66). In Sakamoto et al., original image data and another image data obtained by shifting by one pixel are used. However, the images are not displayed on a display with different pixel arrangements frame by frame. Rather, the image data is made on a frame by over overlapping the original image and the one pixel shifted image. The image data so produced is then displayed on a display (Figs. 13-14). Therefore, the feature of displaying an image with different pixel arrangements for each frame is never taught

or suggested by Sakamoto et al.. In this regard, Sakamoto et al. discloses only an invention directed to expressing a blurred image obtained by overlapping two images.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejected claims are not obvious in view of the cited reference for the reasons stated above. Reconsideration of the rejections of claim 5, and 6-8 which depend therefrom, and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully request a one (1) month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. Please charge the fee of \$110 for the extension of time to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By Frank J. Jordan by:
Frank J. Jordan
Reg. No. 20,456
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340

Jenny & Thel
Reg No. 36,049

enc: Replacement drawing sheets containing Figs. 1, 2 and 3; Substitute Specification; and Marked reproduction of original specification.